

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully submits this Amendment After Final in response to the Final Office Action mailed on 19 May 2006.

The application was originally filed with claims 1-26. The Amendment After Final amends claims 1, 3, 6-8, 12-15, and 18-22, and cancels claims 2, 4, and 5. Thus, claims 1, 3, and 6-26 as amended are pending in the application after entry of the Amendment.

As required by 35 U.S.C. § 132, no new matter has been added. The amendments made to the claims and the new claims are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

As will be apparent, the Amendment raises no new issues and requires no further substantial examination by the USPTO. Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the application as amended.

In the Final Office Action mailed on 19 May 2006, the Examiner allowed claims 23-26. In response, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's early indication of allowability and submits that the invention as defined by such claims should be entitled to broad coverage as warranted under the law.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on US Patent Application Publication US2005/0037755 A1 (Hind et al.) and other references including US Patent Application Publication US2004/0203610 A1 (Deeds). In response, the Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that all previous claims are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons stated in the previous response.

To expedite prosecution and allowance of the application, however, the Applicants amend the rejected claims in accordance with the allowed method claims 23-26.

In particular, independent claim 12 is a “mobile communication device” claim which has been amended to include all limitations of allowed method claim 23; dependent claims 13-17 dependent from independent claim 12 include similar or previously recited limitations.

Independent claim 18 is a “computer program product” claim which has been similarly amended to include all limitations of allowed method claim 23; dependent claims 19-22 dependent from independent claim 18 include similar or previously recited limitations.

Finally, independent claim 1 is another “method” claim which has been amended to include all limitations of allowed method claim 23 as well as additional limitations similar to claim 24; dependent claims 3 and 6-11 dependent from independent claim 1 include similar or previously recited limitations.

Thus, since the Amendment raises no new issues and requires no further substantial examination by the USPTO, entry of the amendment and allowance of the application is hereby requested.

As provided above, the claims as amended are allowable over the prior art of record. The Applicant further submits that the application is in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if there are any questions or concerns regarding this submission.

Date: 22 June 2006

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 USA

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850